



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/981,238	10/17/2001	Dale K. Bell	60,130-1197/01MRA0362	5578

26096 7590 08/18/2006  
CARLSON, GASKEY & OLDS, P.C.  
400 WEST MAPLE ROAD  
SUITE 350  
BIRMINGHAM, MI 48009

EXAMINER

JOYCE, WILLIAM C

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3682	

DATE MAILED: 08/18/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

APPLICATION NO./ CONTROL NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR / PATENT IN REEXAMINATION	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
---------------------------------	-------------	---	---------------------

09/98,238

EXAMINER
----------

ART UNIT	PAPER
----------	-------


20060815

DATE MAILED:

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner for Patents

The reply brief filed June 12, 2006 has been entered and considered. The application has been forwarded to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences for decision on the appeal.

  
WILLIAM C. JOYCE  
PRIMARY EXAMINER

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

001/003

JUN 12 2006

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

Appellant: Dale K. Bell  
Serial No.: 09/981,238  
Filed: October 17, 2001  
Group Art Unit: 3682  
Examiner: Julie Knecht Smith  
Title: AXLE LUBRICANT ISOLATION

**REPLY BRIEF**

Commissioner for Patents  
Washington, D.C. 20231

Dear Sir:

This is in response to the Examiner's Answer mailed on April 12, 2006.

**Claims 1 and 11:**

On page 5 of the Examiner's Answer, the Examiner argues that "Applicant has misinterpreted the Final Rejection because the Glaze reference was not used to teach the claimed seal arrangement, but was used to teach the basic structure of a conventional differential assembly." However, the Examiner must look at the teachings of the references as a whole, otherwise the Examiner is merely picking and choosing elements to make the rejection. Here, the Examiner cannot simply ignore the particular structure or problems faced in Glaze, which is being used as the base reference.

**CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE**

I hereby certify that the Reply Brief is being facsimile transmitted to the United States patent and Trademark Office, fax number (571) 273-8300 on June 12, 2006.

  
Lesley Upton